

3-15-2003

The Portland Spectator, March 2003

Portland State University. Student Publications Board

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/spectator>

Recommended Citation


Portland State University. Student Publications Board, "The Portland Spectator, March 2003" (2003). *Portland Spectator*. Book 7.
<http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/spectator/7>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Portland Spectator by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

STUDENT ELECTIONS • PREACHER DAN • MOST HATED MAN IN ILLINOIS

The Portland Spectator

MARCH 2003



PSU Architecture

Many ideas, a few buildings, one campus



MISSION STATEMENT

The purpose of the Portland Spectator is to provide the students, faculty, and staff with the alternative viewpoint to the left-wing mentality forced upon all at Portland State University. The Portland Spectator is concerned with the defense and advancement of the ideals under which our great Republic was founded. Our viewpoint originates from the following principles:

Individual Liberty

Limited Government

Free Market Economy and Free Trade

The Rule of Law

The Portland Spectator is published by the Portland State University Publication Board; and is staffed solely by volunteer editors and writers. The Portland Spectator is funded through incidental student fees, advertisement revenue, and private donations. Our aim is to show that a conservative philosophy is the proper way to approach issues of common concern. In general the staff of the Portland Spectator share beliefs in the following:

- We believe that the academic environment should become again an open forum, where there is a chance for rational and prudent arguments to be heard. The current environment of political correctness, political fundamentalism and mob mentality stifle genuine political debate.
- We support high academic standards.
- We believe that each student should be judged solely on his/her merits.
- We oppose the special or preferential treatment of any one person or group.
- We believe in an open, fair and small student government.
- We believe that equal treatment yields inequality inherent in our human nature.
- We oppose unequal treatment in order to yield equality, for this violates any principle of justice that can maintain a free and civilized society.
- We oppose the welfare state that either benefits individuals, groups or corporations. The welfare state in the long run creates more poverty, dependency, social and economic decline.
- We believe in Capitalism, and that the sole role of government in economic matters is to provide the institutional arrangements that allow capitalism to flourish.
- We do not hate the rich; we do not idolize the poor.
- We believe in an activist U.S. foreign policy that seeks to promote and establish freedom, political and economic, all around the world.
- We believe, most importantly, in the necessity of patriotic duty consistent with the preservation and advancement of our Republic.

**The
Portland
Spectator**

LIFE LIBERTY PROPERTY

Editor-in-Chief

Napoleon Linardatos

Managing Editor

Joey Coon

Senior Editor

Shahriyar Smith

Copy Editor

Janet Rogers

Technology Director

Tom McShane

Contributors

Sean H. Boggs

S. J. Campbell

Eusibio Castillo

Patricia Elliot

Keith Frieze

Seth Hatmaker

Matthew Hebebrand

Stephen Heckman

Brian Danielson

Justice McPherson

Dan Mikhno

Nathan Pawlicki

Mateusz Perkowski

Julia Moore

Larry A. Smith

Cartoonist

Dion Lienhard

**MEMBER OF THE COLLEGIATE
NETWORK**

The Portland Spectator is published by the Student Publication Board of PSU. All signed essays and commentaries herein represent the opinions of the writers and not necessarily the opinions of the magazine or its staff.

The Portland Spectator accepts letters to the editor and commentaries from students, faculty and staff at the Portland State University. Please limit your letters to 300 words.

We reserve the right to edit material we find obscene, libelous, inappropriate or lengthy. We are not obliged to print anything that does not suit us. Unsolicited material will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Submission constitutes testimony as to the accuracy.

-Each person limited to 3 copies

-Copyright © 2003 The Portland Spectator. All rights reserved.

THIS ISSUE SUCKS

Contact Information

Email:
portlandspectator@hotmail.com

Tips:
tips@portlandspectator.com

Web Site:
portlandspectator.com

Address:

The Portland Spectator
PO Box 347, Portland
OR 97207

Location:
Smith Memorial
Center S-28
(sub-basement)

Telephone:
503.725.9795

Office Hours:
Monday 1pm-5pm
Tuesday 1pm-3pm

CONTENTS

March 2003 • Volume 2 • Issue 6

Departments

- 4 Parenthesis
- 6 Editorial
- 23 Healthy Body Sick Mind
- 24 Back Page Satire

Articles

- 7 Confederacy of Dunces S. J. CAMPBELL
- 8 Throwing the Switch MATEUSZ PERKOWSKI
- 9 A War for Oil? MAX BOOT
- 10 Why the War is Necessary KENNETH M. POLLACK
- 12 An Unstable Region JOEY COON
- 13 The Folks from Paris NAPOLEON LINARDATOS
- 14 Fashion Statements SHAHRIYAR SMITH
- 15 Friendly Foods JUSTICE McPHERSON
- 16 Going Ballistic SETH HATMAKER
- 21 FRENCH MILITARY HISTORY

Fiction

- 17 Big Night Out MIRANDA SANCHEZ



Books & Arts

- 18 PSU Architecture P. L. CARRICO

STUDENT ELECTIONS 2003

Go to portlandspectator.com for coverage of the student elections. On March 12, 13 and 14 there will be news and commentary online. The website will be updating at 7:30 pm.

portlandspectator.com



PARENTHESIS

Effective medicine

To circumvent a Supreme Court ruling that prohibits the execution of the insane, a federal appeals court in St. Louis ruled that officials could force a prisoner on death row to take antipsychotic medication to make him sane enough to be put to death.

Judge Wollman, who spoke for the majority, explained that "eligibility for execution is the only unwanted consequence of the medication." That's one hell of a side effect.

Legitimate concern, or psychosis?

England- Public officials who support the Campaign for Press and Broadcasting Freedom are calling for a new communication bill that would ban American words from British airwaves and T.V. screens.

One spokesman argues that English "words are beautiful and we should do everything possible to stop them becoming extinct."

Another supporter of the bill explains that if the ban were not enacted, "viewers would find themselves inflicted with Americanisms such as fries instead of chips and sidewalk rather than pavement."

Alcohol-free

A 19-year-old Iranian man has been sentenced to death by hanging for the repeated offense of drinking alcohol. Under Iran's Islamic Law alcohol consumption is forbidden, and if caught a third time an offender may be executed.

The young man charged has twice been arrested and whipped for the same "crime."

portlandspectator.com

SPRING BREAK IDEAS

Hawra al-Zuad, is a 16-year-old student at an Islamic academy in suburban Detroit. Her sky blue headscarf seems to coexist comfortably with her marked Detroit accent. Although she doesn't remember her family's flight 12 years ago, she is eager to return to her native Iraq. "I'll go visit right away," she says. "I want to go see how it is over there. I forgot everything about it. I want to see my house, where I used to live when I was little."

A good way to spend summer vacation, I suggest. She quickly corrects me.

"Spring break. I hope it's spring break."

LIEBERMAN GOES TO IOWA



Lieberman must know that Iowa has been a graveyard for Democratic hawks. Henry "Scoop" Jackson, the hawkish Democratic senator, competed in the caucuses twice in the '70s, coming in last both times. In 1988, Al Gore, the most hawkish

Democrat in the presidential field that year, picked a public fight with STARPAC and ultimately skipped the caucuses, complaining that they "reward ideological purity rather than intellectual honesty."

Some Democrats in Iowa think Lieberman is toying with that idea, but he insists he will be competitive and even goes out of his way to praise the spirit of antiwar activism. "It says something good about the American people that a lot of our fellow Americans don't want to go to war," he says. "Members of Congress who support military action against Iraq, which I have, must listen to those voices of protest."

ARTISTIC COMPROMISE



"Daredevil," the new comic-book spectacular, has exactly one good scene. Ben Affleck, as a blind lawyer who becomes a superhero by night, meets Jennifer Garner, playing an heiress and martial-arts expert, and follows her; the two then get to know each other by fighting in a city park—spinning, kicking, and jumping, with a flapping seesaw as a prop. Much of the rest of "Daredevil" is so dark that you can't see it.

I don't think you're missing a great deal. The movie is derivative, flat, halfhearted, its squareness unrelieved by irony or fantasy. Affleck, in his maroon jumpsuit, flips from nowhere to nowhere in a black-on-black digital New York that seems based on sketches rejected by the creators of the

first "Batman."

Change of plans

After attempting to remove Daniel Lee aka 'Preacher Dan' from the park blocks it seems that the administrations ploy backfired. The original idea was to reserve the park blocks stage from 11am to 5pm every day until the end of the year. After free speech issues came into play, a concerned administration had a meeting with Daniel where the issue was resolved. Daniel now has the stage reserved from 11 am to 5 pm every day until the end of the year.

Just desserts

ASPSU President Kristen Wallace might be impeached two weeks before the new elections. Now, one would be inclined to ask, 'With only two weeks left before the new elections, why bother?' Easy, it's a matter of principle. Ms. Wallace has probably spent more time in Salem than most students at Willamette. She has also violated almost every aspect of her job duties as written in the constitution. Apparently it took this long for someone to notice.

Tax increase for beer?

The "its time for a dime committee" is pushing for a tax increase on beer. The current tax on each bottle of beer is less than a cent. The "committee" wants to raise it to ten cents a bottle. This means a tax increase of more than a thousand percent. 24 packs of Pabst would go up almost \$2.40! Hell, why not just by micro? We may even be looking at \$9 for a six pack of micro brew. It's too horrible to imagine. It's not just a dime, it's the livelihood and self esteem of many college students.

portlandspectator.com

Student Elections 2003 - Candidates for President & Vice



Michael-Sean Kelly &
Rebecca Pierce

What's your first priority?

Involving students as much as possible. Whether a student can give a minute or a month of their time, it is important that they have an impact at this university.

What would you do differently than the current executive?

We want to work more on campus than the current administration has. A lot of time was spent in Salem this year when plenty could have happened here at PSU.

What's your favorite book?

Rebecca's *A Separate Peace*

What's your favorite movie?

Rebecca's *Memento*



Amara Marino &
Joe Johnson

What's your first priority?

Our first priority is to represent ALL students by accomplishing four goals:
- Continuing Commitment to Multiculturalism and Diversity - Securing Student Representation within University Administration
- Keeping PSU Affordable and Accessible for All Students
- Increasing Student Leadership and Involvement in the Campus Community

What would you do differently than the current executive?

Two areas of concern that currently exist would be the lack of communication between Executive Staff and the other branches of ASPSU, and a failure to meet deadlines. Both issues will be addressed and resolved in the Marino/Johnson Administration.

What's your favorite book?
Amara's *The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down*
Joe's *Animal Farm*

What's your favorite movie?

Amara's *Strictly Ballroom*
Joe's *Tommy Boy*



Ammar Shihab &
Sarah Campbell

What's your first priority?

Our first priority would be to fill all vacant positions in the student government—the sooner we get these positions filled the faster we can get the ball rolling on our campaign goals!

What would you do differently than the current executive?

We would focus on group cohesiveness and solidarity—seeking to stave off any personal agendas or biases that may surface. We will accomplish this by bringing together a diverse group of people and set our goals for the year as a team.

What's your favorite book?
Ammar's *The Count of Monte Cristo*
Sarah's *Gulliver's Travels*

What's your favorite movie?

Ammar's *Snatch*
Sarah's *Beautiful Girls*

EDITORIAL

How OSPIRG Deceives Students

OSPIRG runs for the Student Fee Committee. Prepare yourself for a radical redefinition of the term viewpoint neutral. You may accuse OSPIRG of many things but not for lack of persistence. Of course who wouldn't do as much to get their hands on \$120,000, especially when you are used to getting this money without much hassle?

Since our first editorial on the subject appeared in January (ENRONizing OSPIRG) a few things have happened. OSPIRG went before the Student Fee Committee (SFC) in January. As per usual OSPIRG tried to supplement its lofty goals for the financial information it must give like any other student group. During the appeal hearings in February OSPIRG went back to SFC but without being more forthcoming in any substantial way. Again, instead of being clear and precise regarding how it spends student money, OSPIRG preferred to talk about lofty goals and community support.

~~Now OSPIRG is trying to deceive students directly.~~

Perhaps you have seen the posters around campus. One informs the students that if they want to help the hungry and the homeless they should vote yes on the 'referendum' that gives OSPIRG \$120,000. OSPIRG is trying to exploit the good feelings that students have for needy people in order to finance their exorbitant salaries.

According to the budget they submitted to SFC, salaries, salary taxes and benefits would total \$334,757, that's 78% of their budget. The homeless and the hungry hearing these numbers would surely breath a sigh of relief. Help is on the way.

OSPIRG won't talk about these numbers to the students. They won't tell students that on average they spend \$225 on campus out of \$120,000. They won't tell the students that they send thousands of dollars every year to the national office without telling the SFC. They won't tell the students that they took money from PSU students to spend on other campuses. They won't tell students that time and again they have been

Of Vaginas, Preachers and Free Speech

Universities are often considered to be ardent defenders of our First Amendment right to free speech. Students are always quick to expose what they consider to be infringements on our ability to express ourselves. Recently students have spoken out against the University of Portland's decision to ban the Vagina Monologues, while at PSU our student leaders are building a coalition to "ensure that students' free speech is protected through our continued control of student fees."

But, while on the surface it may appear that students value free speech, recent events at Portland State seem to indicate otherwise.

Daniel Lee, commonly known as "Preacher Dan", has long been a fixture at PSU. Throughout the year Daniel can often be found in the park blocks delivering one fire and brimstone sermon after another. Needless to say, his views are not well received. He has repeatedly referred to women who engage in premarital sex as "whores", and seems to enjoy telling each person who disagrees with his fiery brand of Christianity that they will forever burn in hell.

Many students on campus understandably regard Daniel's sermons as offensive. Recently the PSU administration attempted to specifically remove Preacher Dan from the park blocks by reserving the space from 11 am to 5 pm every day of the year. Giving the administration the ability to force individuals "who may be environmentally but not legally disruptive" to "leave the area."

A Police officer recently explained that Daniel would be issued a citation, or would ultimately be arrested

if he continued to speak in the park blocks, on the grounds that his preaching exceeded the acceptable decibel level allowed in a public park (somehow the amplified bands that frequently play during spring term manage to avoid arrest). A student who witnessed the scene expressed his approval of removing the preacher and stated, "I am all for freedom of speech, but I don't agree with this guy."

Our very own student senate, in a February 26 meeting, discussed a possible resolution to ban Daniel from preaching in the park blocks due not only to his disruptiveness, but because, in the eloquent words of senator Cain Lowery, "Preacher Dan is an asshole."

It appears that many students and administrators support the freedom of speech so long as it does not protect ideas they find offensive. What they fail to understand is that it is the protection of unpopular ideas and viewpoints that makes the First Amendment important. If the freedom of speech was reserved for popular opinion then it would be meaningless, for there would be no one to oppose widely accepted ideas.

The fact of the matter is that the park blocks are public property, and anyone, no matter how ignorant or ridiculous their views, ought to be able to speak as they please. There is no law against being offensive, but there is a Constitution that protects the rights of us all, "assholes" included.

Those who would suppress the views of anyone compromise our most fundamental freedoms. We must not allow self-appointed thought police to dictate what is appropriate or inappropriate to say. If

Confederacy of Dunces

'Preacher Daniel' and his enlightened student opposition. BY S. J. CAMPBELL

EACH day you see Preacher Dan out there speaking, there is almost always a crowd of students in the front row, hungry to listen to what he has to say. Not so they can learn, of course, or even so they can hear another point of view, another perspective which they may then consider and compare with their own understanding. Rather, these students are merely sitting by, listening in quotes as it were. As though it were the punch line of a joke that they would be there, that they would listen to Preacher Dan in the first place.

It is the punch line to the joke that vaguely runs 'I am an enlightened college student in the twenty-first century, sitting down listening, actually listening to some bearded street preacher telling me his obsessive interpretation of the Bible.'

These students sit there waiting for Preacher Dan to say something about which they feel they can disagree, and then, if they are taking the irony of their attention seriously, they will try to disagree with Preacher Dan about what he has presented. They will shout out their mocking disagreements and wait for Preacher Dan to take the bait. Then we can all get into a rip snortin' wailer of a verbal brawl.

The problem however, is that it isn't Preacher Dan that ends up the punch line, but the students themselves. I have taken the time to stand by and listen, really listen, to the things being said on both sides, and the fact of the matter is

that the elite twenty-first century intellectuals are losing to a common street preacher. And they're losing badly.

Now before anyone jumps to dismissing conclusion that this would be said because I agree with, and am secretly championing the same ideology as Preacher Dan, let it be



understood that I am an agnostic, tending more often than not toward the atheistic. I have a hard time myself believing in a God so inartistic and literal as the one being presented through the traditional conceptions of most organized religion. It's simply an aesthetic complaint: God wouldn't be so clumsy with metaphor. Having said that, I am willing to listen to different people's interpretations of that same awkward art. So when I go out and stand by, listening to Preacher Dan preach and enlightened liberal students responding, I am listening to the open exchange of opinions and ideas, hopefully without prejudice. And if I do

favor one side over another, it is supporting the intellectuals, those who feel that, as students, knowledge and ideas are things of worth, things to be sought out and appreciated.

This is why the common scene has become such a disappointment. The students, rather than being open to Preacher Dan's understanding of reality, even intellectually, as they would if the same idea were being explained to them by a professor standing at the head of the class, who prefaces everything with "And these Christians believe..." are simply mocking him. They bark out their petty complaints and witticisms and then laugh as though they'd really gotten him. But they haven't. And when Preacher Dan responds, he does so accurately, intelligently, and with all the truth of his understanding. And the students lose.

Because whether you like it or not, Preacher Dan is simply more educated, and more familiar with the subject than any of his detractors. He knows this stuff. And the students don't even know that they don't know. They seem to think that, by virtue of the fact that they are enlightened students, their opinions are worth more than those of a common street preacher, with or without the knowledge and familiarity of subject matter to back them up. And it shows. When Preacher Dan lays down a truth as he understands it, and

continued on page 22

By demeaning him, by mocking him, by assaulting him both verbally and physically, they're making his position easier. It's much easier to feel right and righteous when you're being made into a martyr for your beliefs than it is to coldly stand before an intellectual crowd and answer for each and every point of faith.

Throwing the Switch

The suspicious past of ex-Illinois Gov. Ryan . BY MATEUSZ PERKOWSKI

GOVERNOR George Ryan has recently succeeded in becoming a champion of justice to leftist activists around the world. His decision to commute the sentences of all inmates awaiting the death penalty in the state of Illinois has been hailed as a “historic decision” by the ACLU: “one man’s courageous attempt” to reform the capital punishment system. Britain’s *The Guardian* stated that Gov. Ryan “has set a fine example for the entire United States to follow.” According to the *Washington Post*, “from across the world, bouquets of praise have been landing at the feet of...Gov. George Ryan following his decision.” Nelson Mandela and the President of Mexico have personally called Ryan to congratulate him on his resolve. International merit in support of the former Illinois governor is overwhelming; he has even been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize.

The citizens of Illinois, however, are celebrating for entirely different reasons. “Monday was a great day for the state of Illinois,” writes the editor of the *Chicago Daily Herald*, “as we finally rid ourselves of the most arrogant, two-faced, corrupt and unfeeling public official in the state’s history.” Despite his last-minute “blanket clemency” for convicted murderers, George Ryan ended his career as an extremely unpopular governor. The McCulloch Research & Polling firm has found that if Ryan were to seek re-election, he would receive only 27% of the vote. Even in the former governor’s own Republican Party, the majority claimed they would not vote for him if given the chance. Clearly, the residents of Illinois have a much less enthusiastic perception of George Ryan than does the global community. Perhaps this is because they are better acquainted with Ryan’s real

political record, and not just his latest public-relations shenanigans. Ryan’s boldness in imposing a moratorium on the death penalty is admired by liberals everywhere. But the former governor



has demonstrated a similar bravado throughout his political career, although it has usually been directed at getting power and money for himself and his friends.

Right up to the last minute, George Ryan was abusing his authority. Governor Rod Blagojevich, Ryan’s successor, has spent his first few days on the job removing 35 of Ryan’s indulgent cohorts from the state bureaucracy. According to Blagojevich, “The Ryan administration ended their days in office by using the power at their discretion to put friends and associates in high-paying jobs. I intend to use every power that I have as governor to eliminate unqualified, unnecessary, and overpaid individuals wherever I find them in state government.” Ryan also tried to shorten probationary periods for his appointees, so that they would stay embedded in the government after the new governor had taken over.

As shameful these “11th hour appointments” are, they pale in comparison to other incidents in Ryan’s career. Even his election to the post of governor was plagued with political trickery. In the extremely close 1998 race for Illinois governorship, Libertarian candidate Jim Tobin posed the danger of costing Ryan a serious amount of votes. A month before the election, all third-party candidates were suddenly removed from the ballot by the Illinois State Board of Elections. Tobin claimed that the removal was entirely arranged by the Secretary of State, George Ryan. This allegation turned out to be credible when the *Chicago Tribune* exposed the fact that 73 state employees, a great number of whom worked for Ryan, had “illegally participated in the effort to keep Libertarians off the ballot.” The Illinois Citizens Committee for Cleaning up the Courts later surfaced reports indicating that Ryan had bribed members of the State Board of Elections, as well as other state agencies. Nonetheless, Ryan won the election with a 4% margin of the vote.

Of course, George Ryan accomplished a lot more during his stint as Secretary of State than just illegally influence state elections. In what is considered to be the most humiliating episode in Ryan’s 34 years of government service, the “bribes for licenses” scandal, 28 people who worked under Ryan while he was Secretary of State were indicted on charges of bribery. (17 have already confessed.) According to federal prosecutors, Ryan’s employees were accepting cash in return for unauthorized commercial driver’s licenses, and a great portion of the money was finding its way into the Secretary of State’s gubernatorial campaign

continued on page 22

A War for Oil?

Many would like to think so. **BY MAX BOOT**

WHEN Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld visited "Old Europe" last week, the placards and protesters lining his path were a visceral reminder of what the Bush administration already knew: Solid majorities in key European countries think that greed is our motive for wanting to depose Saddam Hussein. In fact, in a recent Pew Research Center poll 75 percent of respondents in France, 54 percent in Germany and 76 percent in Russia said that America wants to invade Iraq because "the U.S. wants to control Iraqi oil."

Although Americans are divided on the wisdom of an invasion, only 22 percent of us subscribe to the cynical view that it's just about oil. Even Jimmy Carter, hardly a hawk, rebutted the accusation at the Nobel Peace Prize ceremony: "I know my country, I know my people, and I can assure you that's not the policy of my government."

What accounts for this trans-Atlantic disconnect? To answer that question, start by considering the accusation on the merits: Is America going into Iraq in search of "black gold"?

The charge has a surface plausibility because Iraq does have the second-largest known reserves in the world. But we certainly don't need to send 250,000 soldiers to get at it. Saddam Hussein would gladly sell us all the oil we wanted. The only thing preventing unlimited sales are the United States-enforced sanctions, which Baghdad (and the big oil companies) would love to see lifted. Washington has refused to go along because Saddam Hussein flouts United Nations resolutions. This suggests that our primary focus is the threat he poses, not the oil he possesses.

It's true that overthrowing Saddam Hussein would lead to the lifting of

sanctions and a possible increase in oil exports. But it would take a lot of time and money to rebuild Iraq's dilapidated oil industry, even if the regime didn't torch everything on the way out. A study from the Council on Foreign Relations and



the James A. Baker III Institute at Rice University estimated that it would take three years and \$5 billion to restore Iraqi production just to its pre-1990 level of 3.5 million barrels a day. That would increase total world production by only 1.3 percent, and might not reduce prices at all if other countries cut output or banded together to keep prices stable.

Some optimists think a postwar Iraq would stiff OPEC and slash prices radically. This seems unlikely, if the experience of Kuwait is anything to go by. While oil prices spiked before the Persian Gulf war and plummeted afterward, the long-term impact has been close to nil. Kuwait hasn't exactly been offering to fill up American sport utility vehicles free out of gratitude for being liberated. It hasn't even carried out its pledge to allow direct foreign investment in state-owned oil fields.

As with Kuwait, a liberated Iraq would likely remain an enthusiastic member of OPEC because it

would need to establish its nationalist credentials and maintain amicable relations with its oil-cartel neighbors.

For that matter, would our government really want a steep drop in prices? The domestic oil patch — including President Bush's home state, Texas — was devastated in the 1980's when prices fell as low as \$10 a barrel. Washington is generally happy with a range of \$18 to \$25 a barrel, about where oil was before the strikes in Venezuela and jitters about Iraq helped push prices over \$34 a barrel. If we were really concerned about cheap oil above all, we'd be sending troops to Caracas, not Baghdad.

The other possible economic advantage in Iraq would be for American companies to win contracts to put out fires, repair refineries and help operate the oil industry, as they did in Kuwait. What's the total value of such work? It's impossible to say, but last year Iraq signed a deal with Russian companies (since canceled by Saddam Hussein) to rebuild oil and other industries, valued at \$40 billion over five years.

Yet the White House estimates the military operation alone would cost \$50 billion to \$60 billion. (Others suggest the figure would be far higher.) And rebuilding of the country's cities, roads and public facilities would cost \$20 billion to \$100 billion more, with much of that money in the initial years coming from the "international community" (read: Uncle Sam).

Thus, if a capitalist cabal were running the war, it would have to conclude it wasn't a paying proposition.

This doesn't mean that oil is entirely irrelevant to the subject of Iraq. It does matter in one very important way: Oil revenues make

continued on page 22

Why the War is Necessary

A last chance to stop Saddam Hussein. BY KENNETH M. POLLACK

WITH the Bush administration set to put a resolution on Iraq before the United Nations Security Council next week, those opposed to war will rally around the notion that Saddam Hussein can be deterred from aggression. They will continue to say that the mere presence of United Nations inspectors will prevent him from building nuclear weapons, and that even if he were to acquire them he could still be contained.


Unfortunately, these claims fly in the face of 12 years — and in truth more like 30 years — of history.

Observers have a very poor track record in predicting the progress of the Iraqi nuclear weapons program. In the late 1980's, the nuclear experts of the American intelligence services were convinced that the Iraqis were at least 5 and probably 10 years away from having a nuclear weapon. For its part, the International Atomic Energy Agency did not even believe that Iraq had a nuclear weapons program. After the 1991 Persian Gulf war, United Nations inspectors found that not only did Iraq have a program far more extensive than anyone had realized, but it was also less than two years away from producing a weapon.

Four years later, the international agency was so certain that it had eradicated the Iraqi nuclear program that it wanted to end aggressive inspections in favor of passive "monitoring." Then a slew of defectors came out of Iraq — including Hussein Kamel al-Majid, the son-in-law of Saddam Hussein who led the Iraqi program to build weapons of mass destruction; Wafiq al-Samarrai, one of Saddam Hussein's intelligence chiefs; and Khidhir Hamza, a leading scientist with the nuclear weapons program. These defectors reported that outside pressure had not only failed to eradicate the nuclear pro-

gram, it was bigger and more cleverly spread out and concealed than anyone had imagined it to be.

In the late 1990's, American and international nuclear experts again concluded that the Iraqi nuclear program was dormant: yes, the sci-



entists were still working in teams; yes, they still had all of the plans; and yes, they probably were hiding some machinery — but they were not making any progress. Then another batch of important defectors escaped to Europe and told Western intelligence services that after the inspectors left Iraq in 1998, Saddam Hussein had started a crash program to build a nuclear weapon and that the Iraqis had devised methods to hide the effort.

The reports of these defectors prompted the German intelligence service in 2001 to conclude that Iraq was only three to six years away from having one or more nuclear weapons. Today, the American, British and Israeli intelligence services believe that unless he is stopped, Saddam Hussein is likely to acquire a nuclear weapon in the second half of this decade.

Even this estimate may be overly

optimistic. While it's true that the presence of weapons inspectors does hamper the Iraqis, there are some critical caveats. We simply do not know how close Iraq is to acquiring a nuclear weapon, nor do we know to what extent the inspectors' presence is slowing the Iraqi program. What we do know is that for more than a decade we have consistently overestimated the ability of inspectors to impede the Iraqi efforts and we have consistently underestimated how far along Iraq has been toward acquiring a nuclear weapon.

For all of these reasons the assurances from Mohamed ElBaradei, the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, that he has Iraq's nuclear program well in hand should be less than comforting.

Nor is there reason to be confident about how Saddam Hussein will behave once he has acquired a nuclear weapon.

He has been anything but circumspect about his aspirations: He has stated that he wants to turn Iraq into a "superpower" that will dominate the Middle East, to liberate Jerusalem and to drive the United States out of the region. He has said he believes the only way he can achieve his goals is through the use of force. Indeed, his half-brother and former chief of intelligence, Barzan al-Tikriti, was reported to say that Iraq needs nuclear weapons because it wants "a strong hand in order to redraw the map of the Middle East."

It is probably true that fear of retaliation kept Iraq from using chemical weapons against coalition forces during the gulf war. However, this should give us little comfort that he will be similarly deterred in the future. Before the 1991 war, Secretary of State

continued next page

Why the War is Necessary *Continued*

James Baker warned his Iraqi counterpart, Tariq Aziz, that Iraq faced "terrible consequences" if it used weapons of mass destruction, mounted terrorist attacks or destroyed Kuwaiti oil fields.

Yet despite this warning, Saddam Hussein tried to send terrorist teams to America and did blow up the Kuwaiti oil fields — he simply gambled on which two of the three things Mr. Baker mentioned were unlikely to result in America ending the regime. (Many officials from that Bush administration have suggested, in fact, that Saddam Hussein didn't even make the right calculation.)

Proponents of deterrence also argue that since nobody has ever actually tried to deter Saddam Hussein from attacking another country, how can we claim that doing so will be difficult in the future? The example most often cited is the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, where the common wisdom holds that because of the botched messages he received from the American ambassador, April Glaspie, Iraq had no reason to believe we would fight.

In fact, all the evidence indicates the opposite: Saddam Hussein believed it was highly likely that the United States would try to liberate Kuwait, but convinced himself that we would send only lightly armed, rapidly deployable forces that would be quickly destroyed by his 120,000-man Republican Guard. After this, he assumed, Washington would acquiesce to his conquest.

Much of the evidence for this remains classified, but at least two points can be made using public material: Tariq Aziz has told reporters that this was what Saddam Hussein thought at the time; and we know that when the Republican Guards invaded Kuwait they moved quickly — even before they had consolidated control over the country — to set up

defenses along Kuwait's borders and against amphibious and air-borne landings.

In other words, Saddam Hussein thinks we tried to deter him, and that we failed. He was ready and willing to fight the United States for Kuwait.

Even that crushing defeat, however, didn't dim his adventurism.



Indecision Central

Just two years later he attempted to assassinate the emir of Kuwait and former President Bush. This was not a rational act but a meaningless bid for revenge. And he is lucky that the attempts failed. If they had succeeded, there is no question that the United States would have obliterated his regime.

Then, in October 2000, he dispatched five divisions to western Iraq. All of the evidence available to the American government indicated that, with the acquiescence of Damascus, he intended to move them through Syria and into the Golan Heights. In response, Washington began preparing a military strike far greater than Desert Fox of 1999 (which itself prompted revolts throughout Iraq for six months), and the Israeli military planned its own crushing response. Only American and Saudi diplomatic intervention with Syria, combined with the Iraqi military's logistical problems, quashed the adventure.

Most ominous today, we have heard

from many intelligence sources — including some of the highest-level defectors now in America and abroad — that Saddam Hussein believes that once he has acquired nuclear weapons it is the United States that will be deterred. He apparently believes that America will be so terrified of getting into a nuclear confrontation that it would not dare to stop him should he decide to invade, threaten or blackmail his neighbors.

America has never encountered a country that saw nuclear weapons as a tool for aggression. During the cold war we feared that the Russians thought this way, but we eventually learned that they were far more conservative. Our experts may be split on how to handle North Korea, but they agree that the Pyongyang regime wants nuclear weapons for defensive purposes — to stave off the perceived threat of an American

attack. The worst that anyone can suggest is that North Korea might blackmail us for economic aid or sell such weapons to someone else (with Iraq being near the top of that list). Only Saddam Hussein sees these weapons as offensive — as enabling aggression.

Finally, we cannot forget that all evidence has shown Saddam Hussein to be an incorrigible optimist who willfully ignores signs of danger. Consider that on at least five occasions over the last three decades, he has embarked on foreign policy adventures that nearly destroyed him: his attack on Iraq's Kurds in 1974 (which might have ended in an Iranian assault on Baghdad if the shah of Iran had not unexpectedly decided to double-cross the Kurds instead); his invasion of Iran in 1980; his invasion of Kuwait in 1990; his assassination attempt against former President Bush in 1993; and his threatened attack on Kuwait in 1994. In each case, he took a course of action that we know even his closest advisers

An Unstable Region

Why the Middle East is behind the times. **By JOEY COON**

THE Middle Eastern region, prior to the Middle Ages, was an economic and cultural super power in its own right. It was the birthplace of the West's most cherished historical texts, and was largely responsible for the early development of trade and the division of labor evident in its bustling marketplaces and bazaars. The Middle East was a fountainhead of exploration and innovation, and relative to the rest of the world, was economically prosperous.

Today, Middle Eastern economies are in shambles. With per capita incomes ranging from \$18,000 in the United Arab Emirates to slightly over \$300 in Yemen, millions of people find themselves living in abject poverty.

So why, in the words of Alexander Rose, does a region once dynamic and fruitful "now languish in humiliating poverty in a backward part of the world run by petty tyrants"? In the late 17th and early 18th centuries the West economically surpassed the Islamic world, and hasn't looked back since. Something must explain how the rest of the world was able to progress while the Middle East continues to operate as it did centuries ago.

Timur Kuran, an economist at the University of Southern California, believes that the current state of the Middle East may be the result of policy explicitly prescribed by social leaders to hinder societal change. In his paper, "The Islamic Commercial Crisis: Institutional Roots of the Delay in the Middle East's Economic Modernization," Kuran estimates that sometime between the 9th and 11th century Islamic leaders decided that Islamic culture had reached perfection. In their attempt to continue what they considered a trend toward prosperity, societal criticism and reform were discouraged,

maintaining that only obedience was required to stay the course. Kuran asserts that the Islamic world "was a very innovative culture until then, and many people felt that everything that needed to be known was known."

Another explanation for the



Islamic world's apparent failure to evolve and improve lies in its governmental institutions and the subsequent ability of citizens to own legal title on property. In the United States, the most valuable assets that most people own are their homes. This is often true for the rest of the world as well. The difference lies in the working rules that dictate legal ownership for individual nations. In Hernando de Soto's ground breaking book "The Mystery of Capital," de Soto argues that citizens of Middle Eastern countries have a difficult, if not impossible, time converting these assets into wealth generating capital.

Americans often use their homes as collateral with which to borrow money to finance investments. The problem with the Middle Eastern region is not that they lack capital. In Egypt, for instance, de Soto's research reveals that "the wealth that the poor have accumulated is

worth fifty-five times as much as the sum of all direct foreign investment ever recorded." This wealth, however, is in the form of housing built on land where ownership rights are ambiguous, or in unincorporated businesses that lack defined liability. For those who wish to acquire legal title to land, the process requires the involvement of 31 different bureaucratic agencies and the completion of 77 procedures that can take anywhere from five to fourteen years to complete. It isn't any wonder that 4.7 million Egyptians choose to build their homes illegally. Similar cases abound all over the Middle East. Because the ownership of these possessions is inadequately documented, it makes it very difficult for individuals to convert these assets into capital.

But the inadequate definition and enforcement of property rights are merely a derivative of the far larger problem of mixing socialist economic policy with authoritarian political dominance. Command-and-control economic systems in the region hinder economic growth and destroy any hopes of raising the standard of living. In Iran, for instance, the government effectively discourages the establishment of new businesses with income tax rates as high as 54%, and by screening all foreign investment. Inefficient state owned enterprises and politically powerful individuals use government coercion to marginalize the private sector and maintain iron-grip monopolies.

Freedom House, an international organization that promotes freedom and democracy throughout the world, has developed a rating system to analyze the state of nations around the globe. Of the 15 countries studied in the Middle East, only two, Israel and Turkey had any semblance of democratic procedure. The norm in the region

The Folks from Paris

Why Europeans Don't Like Bush . BY NAPOLEON LINARDATOS

IT'S not often that a foreign policy expert becomes a celebrity. Robert Kagan senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and columnist for the Washington Post has achieved this status. Not a day goes by where his work isn't mentioned on TV or in major newspapers. It all started when this summer when he published *Power and Weakness* at Hoover Institution's *Policy Review*.

Kagan explains that there are certain reasons why Americans and Europeans see the world differently. Europe is in "a post-historical paradise of peace and relative prosperity, the realization of Kant's 'Perpetual Peace.' The United States, meanwhile, remains mired in history, exercising power in the anarchic Hobbesian world where international laws and rules are unreliable and where true security and the defense and promotion of a liberal order still depend on the possession and use of military might."


Americans and the Europeans see the world differently because the former are strong and latter weak. Europeans today act the way Americans acted in the first years of the American nation where it was a rather weak power. Namely, having a soft spot for international norms and law, a preference for negotiation, diplomacy and persuasion. And this is how to explain the European appeasement towards Saddam Hussein. Kagan says "appeasement is never a dirty word to those whose genuine weakness offers few appealing alternatives. For them, it is a policy of sophistication."

Americans on the other hand tend

to be more confrontational, more willing to use force to achieve their ends.

Those who have power are more likely to use it, while those who don't will try to create arrangements that substitute for power and counterbalance those who have power. Each will see the world differently and each will respond differently to crises.

The problem is that



Europeans have allowed themselves to live in this world of peace only because their security is guaranteed by America. According to Kagan, the European Union and other institutions where Europeans have the chance to gloat their multilateralism have been possible only because the United States defeated Nazi Germany and later on protected Europe from the Soviet threat.

But there is another reason Europeans are reluctant to fight. Americans tend idealize freedom. On the other hand, Europeans rely more on authority and process. European states that are leaning left still allow for institutions that, in the eyes of an American, are obsolete and morally bankrupt. Sweden has a king and although his role is purely ceremonial it reflects a meaning and symbolism

that goes deep into the European psyche.

In Europe politicians are respected much more than in the States. They are viewed as experts and retain a bit of reverence reserved for absolute monarchs. Their indiscretions are rarely examined by the judicial branch, where of course the

law explicitly gives immunity to politicians. Jacques Chirac, the French president, is a very ambitious man. He has been trying to become president for many years before he got elected in 1995. But one of the main reasons he wanted to get re-elected as



president was to avoid charges of corruption. As long as he is president he is immune. President Clinton would love the arrangement. Americans though think differently on the matter. American politicians are scrutinized more.

They always emphasize that the government should be a government of laws and not of persons. Politicians are not only scrutinized more extensively in the United States, but they are not viewed the same way they are in Europe. Americans view their politicians as servants, hiring them to do what the public wants.

In Europe, politicians are part of an elite whose function it is to 'educate' the public about what is good for it.

When in some European countries the public failed to vote the 'right' way in referendums the politicians brought the issues back as

Fashion Statements

Lots of noise, not much argument. BY SHAHRIYAR SMITH

THE recent anti-war movement has accomplished many things, but effective opposition to a possible war in Iraq has not been one of them. The recent anti-war demonstrations do not suffer from a lack of support, they suffer from a lack of informed argument. Some of the things they have accomplished can hardly be viewed as admirable; others can be accurately viewed as outright abominable. Riddled with shortcomings, the recent demonstrations instead serve as an insight into exactly how far the some people are willing to go to oppose America.

In viewing any of the recent demonstrations, the first thing that becomes clear is an absence of informed argument. There are many conspiracy theories, catchy slogans and crude appeals to emotion. There are people positing theories involving big oil and 'the Jews' as well as the illuminati. There are many colorful signs bearing juvenile lyrics or old, worn-out slogans. And of course there are pictures, many pictures, depicting the horrors of war involving everything from Iraqi children and elderly, to nuclear blast craters. Amidst all of this there is no clear, dominant, academic argument.

There is something about the environment of these protests that prevents many intelligent people opposing a war, who might otherwise have some such academic argument to posit, from participating. There is too much divergence from the central theme of the demonstration. In the recent demonstrations opposing a possible war with Iraq there have been people advocating things like a 'living wage,' 'saving forests,' 'freeing Mumia' and 'overthrow of the

American government."

Aside from contributing to the lack of a clear, unified argument (however un-academic), this type of divergence serves to keep many people away who would otherwise have valuable things to offer. Many people would have problems



attending peace rallies hosted by the National Rifle Association, not because they are opposed to peace, but because of the association with the NRA.

Similarly, many intelligent people oppose a possible war with Iraq. But it is the inevitable association of them with things they do not agree with that keeps them from participating. By excluding people with radical ideas that have nothing to do with a possible war in Iraq, political moderates have become alienated and the recent demonstrations have become stigmatized with associations of the far left.

There is a degree of truth to this stigmatization. These demonstrations have become a fashion, a method of social conformity among the far left. Too many people are there because it is the 'chic' thing to do. They want to make a fashion statement, to look a certain way, to gain a certain status. A New York Times article recently pointed out

protesters actually trying to get arrested.

The protesters "huddled on the street and debated how to get arrested," the article read. This is just posturing. They want to look like victims. It is their fashion statement, their badge of honor within their political group.

The Washington Post recently reported the marches in Washington and San Francisco were "chiefly sponsored" by a group called "International ANSWER (Act Now to Stop War and End Racism)." The Washington Post goes on to report that International ANSWER is a front group for the Workers World Party, a Stalinist organization. International ANSWER supports any socialist state, including the

North Korean government with its thousands of starving people and pretty much anything that opposes America including Hamas, the Iranian Mullahs and Saddam Hussein.

In its fierce, unrelenting opposition to America, the left has betrayed its own values. The millions that died under Stalin, the slaughter at Tiananmen Square, thousands of starving North Koreans, years of oppression and dictatorship, fascist policies and the oppression and brutalization of the Iraqi people; these are the consequences of the policies supported by major proponents, the "chief sponsors" of the recent demonstrations. These are the roots of anti-Americanism.

The anti-war movement has failed to effectively oppose a possible war with

Iraq. The clear lack of informed academic argument, the divergence that excludes so many, the cheapening of the movement with fads

Friendly Foods

Why GM foods are good for you . BY JUSTICE MCPHERSON

HEALTHY food is organic. No artificial chemicals, no factory processing, not even hybridization. This is the very essence of healthy, at least according to the rhetoric of the health food craze. These are the same people who would have you believe that the absence of modern innovations in food production is the route to perfect health, even as “organic” food is linked to many hospital visits and deaths every year.

A friend of mine once commented on how many of his health-food craving friends had some idealized vision of life in the forest, “like some sort of Disney movie, where the animals of the wild would come up to them carrying baskets of food.” The fact of the matter is that natural often means vicious. Plants and animals in the wild have been spending eons in what amounts to constant warfare. Plants constantly develop new allergenic and toxic chemicals to repel animals. Botulin, the most lethal poison known, is after all, organic and natural. Many of the base foods we eat are not so much healthy as they are not sufficiently lethal to animals of our size and metabolism. These poisons are in the form of a wide variety of evolved proteins in the plants makeup.

Imagine you were going to eat a mystery food. It has been changed from the last iteration, which seemed to be edible. Which one of these two processes seems safer to you?

1. A single ingredient will be added to the food. This ingredient has been tested exhaustively

in a laboratory to make sure that it doesn't cause any allergic reactions. The single new material added has been checked against all known allergens, and tested for toxicity. Finally, the end result has been examined to make sure it is safe to eat and has all the expected



ingredients and no more.

2. The food will be exposed to an unpredictable environment of radiation, random mutagenic chemicals, and the like, and possibly crossbred with some other similar organism; this will cause an unknowable number of random mutations, possibly changing thousands of random genes.

If the plant seems to be growing better than its neighbor, which has also been battered by the same treatment, it is grown and goes to your plate.

Option number one, or course, is what the procedure for GMO foods goes through. Option number two is how they come up with the food you find at the natural food store. It is the standard way of breeding food plants since the age of the Mayans.

Genes from fish are often taken

and used in the GM process. But so what? They aren't transferring over any element of “fishness” in doing such a thing. They are taking the gene for a single protein that is useful and carrying it over. If I take one screw out of the dashboard of my car and use it in the case of my

computer, do I need a drivers license to go online?

A common objection is that GM foods cause allergies. Ninety percent of food allergies are caused by milk, fish, eggs, nuts, wheat, or legumes. If a GMO contains anything from a commonly allergenic food, it has to be labeled as such, unless it can be demonstrated that the protein does not contain allergies. Further, the FDA requests that

new ingredients not use proteins that fit the properties of possible allergens. This is combined with rigorous testing.

Another objections is that pesticides are used in the GM process. Great. GM pest-proofing allows for the most efficient placement of proteins to make the plant unappetizing to certain agricultural pests. These ingredients cannot be added to the plants until they have been approved by the EPA. In addition, all of the proteins so far added are sensitive for heat, acid, and digestion – they don't survive being eaten by mammals such as ourselves.

In parts of the third world, malnutrition is rampant and ubiquitous. Diseases caused by a deficit of basic nutrients are common to the point of being considered normal. The problem, and what was needed to solve it, is obvious. Even

Going Ballistic

Some propaganda on propaganda . BY SETH HATMAKER

PROPAGANDA is a term used frequently as of late. Since the 2000 election, there has been much unrest between liberals and conservatives. Add the 2000 election controversy with the victory of the GOP in 2002 congressional elections, and the upcoming conflict with Iraq, it is no wonder both sides of the political spectrum are accusing one another of propaganda – mind-control.

The *Spectator* deemed it necessary to address this issue so that readers may be enlightened in their political discourse. In its simplest definition propaganda is information used for mind-control, or more accurately, behavior control. Those being controlled can be citizens, consumers, or specific segments of society. Voters are the favored, and probably most targeted, people for propaganda consumption.

Propaganda can be overt, such as that used by Nazi Germany, China, North Korea, and many Arabic countries. Overt propaganda usually appeals to the common good. Typically, propaganda of this sort is controlled by the state, and usually the state owns all media of mass communication.

Propaganda can be subtle, such as that seen in America. Messages are usually disguised as educational information, but have a hidden agenda. Words, and the spin one puts on an issue, are very important in subtle forms of propaganda. Societies using subtle propaganda usually have diverse viewpoints competing for influence over the public's behavior.

This being said, how can one identify propaganda? There is not a simple way to answer this question, but there are some things to look for that can indicate whether or not a message is a form of propaganda. First, one should see if the message plays on emotions.

Propaganda is successful only if it can influence an action. Playing to emotions, rather than reason or logic, can cause people to act quickly and without thought about consequences. Fear is a popular emotion used by propaganda producers.



Second, one ought to question whom is the message directed towards. Historically, propaganda has been directed to the public as a whole. So appeals to the American people, or the people of Iraq, ought to be scrutinized to see if an agenda is behind them.

Third, one should, if at all possible, see who is behind the message. That is to say, people who produce propaganda usually have motives for doing so. They want people to vote for measure X. Analyzing the message giver can be very enlightening on whether or not the message is propaganda.

To illustrate the point, the news coverage on Measure 28, the “temporary” income tax increase, shows how propaganda works. Coverage of Measure 28 went as far east as The Washington Post, and as far north as Seattle Times. The disturbing thing about the coverage on Measure 28 is that it was, for all intent purposes, propaganda. For instance, people quoted in the papers were in favor of Measure 28. Opponents of Measure 28 were underrepresented in articles. One article actually quoted a Republican – who happened to be

in favor of Measure 28.

Another indicator of propaganda and Measure 28 coverage was the emotional appeals in the articles. The articles interviewed elderly citizens who were “going to be thrown out on the streets.” The articles went into detail on how elderly citizens were going to lose social benefits. The articles also quoted prison officials who claimed that they had no choice but to let prisoners out on the streets. Schools reported that they would have to close schools 15-24 days early if Measure 28 failed. Kinda tugs at your heart, don’t it?

Measure 28 coverage told us what was going to happen, and how, but it conveniently left out why. I mean, truly, why. The coverage did not mention the extravagant budgets school administrators oversee. The coverage did not mention salaries administrators receive. (For the record, schools chose to close 10 days early - about half as much as they claimed they were going to.) As far as the prisoners, coverage failed to mention the rules and guidelines already in place when prisoners must be released. As far as the elders, coverage did not go into the inflated costs of caring for the elderly. These costs victimize our elders - a great many of whom we are indebted to for building a great country. It seems to me that why these things are taking place is the important question. Why are government officials choosing to do this?

Of all of the coverage on Measure 28, one article mentioned two words that can help people of all political ideologies understand the Oregon budget. These two words being “biennial budget.” Oregon functions on a two-year budget. But, did the article go into analysis of the Oregon budgeting process? No.

As many of us know, Measure 28

FICTION

Big Night Out

BY MIRANDA SANCHEZ

"Go" whispered out into the night air and echoed against the cacti. "Go. It won't hurt you." The noise faded into the darkness and all was still again. Not a breath caressed its way through the valley by night, and tonight it was as still as the world ever got, though perhaps even stiller, as there were two little sets of eyes present to witness it. The sarcophagal stillness was enhanced by witness and the witnesses, summoning fears of the Tomb, shivered the shiver of death. It was just so still out there. Nothing stirred. Nothing moved. Nothing sounded. Nothing... Nothing. Then, a whisper.

"Go!"

"No way!"

"What... you think its gonna swallow you up?"

"I don't see you going first."

"That's because I'm not the afraid one."

There was a pause in the conversation and the stillness reasserted its sister sense of sound and the lack thereof. The snide reply broke the rapture rudely.

"That really makes sense to you, doesn't it?"

"Just go!"

The whispers faded, the rock from under which they came wholly indistinguishable from any of the others strewn about the desolate landscape.

"It won't kill you." came, urging. They'd been there for two complete days, three nights, crawling right to the edge of the moon's shadow by night and retreating well below ground when the sun came up.

"Go see it."

"I don't believe its even there."

"Then why don't you go?"

"Because it was your idea in the first place!" was spat out angrily. "And I'm not going to lead this adventure, that's why!" The retort



floated savagely in the night air, seeming to both shoot out into the abyss of space and linger nearby, stuck on cactus pins. The voices hushed at the sound. They kept their speaking reverentially quiet for the soundless night. They both flattened their ears and one twitched his nose in their lightless cloister. Just there, just an inch beyond their whiskers the much discussed moon draped her gentle light.

"It won't kill you."

"Have you ever been?"

"No, but..."

"What?"

"It doesn't hurt the rock."

"Great."

"Oh, come on. We came all this way..."

"So go!" Again the whisper bor-

dered on vocal and the two fell into the reverent silence of the night valley. hot. dry.

The air stuck to their throats, their whiskers. They held back their squeaks of discomfort. There were bigger problems to deal with than any mild discomfort. They both stared at the line of light. Something must be causing it. Something the ancient ones had called the moon.

It lay there the proverbial challenge, the line in the sand. Their world and the world of the moonlight, divided. If you could only... just... step... out...

They twitched their whiskers in time with each other.

"Go!"

"Sssshhhh!"

They stood there, facing the light. Under the rock the two mice adopted the stillness of without. Both worlds stood still, silent, and staring.

Then, one of the mice went, furiously tearing out from the shelter of darkness and rock into the moonlight, darting a small arc and scrambling back towards the dark. In the last split second it threw its tiny dark eyes up to the heavens and saw... not just the moon in all her glory but a sky bespeckled with twitching lights. The moon, full, smiling with her soft lines and then gone... all night, all sound into the darkness and under the rock.

The mouse had heard its companion behind him, dashing out into the night's light, but in the darkness there was no second mouse. The mouse looked around. Nothing, no one. He called softly out into the night. Not a sound. The night was



PSU Architecture

Many ideas, a few buildings, one campus. BY P. L. CARRICO

Smith Memorial

There is a distinct relationship between the architecture and physical design of a University, school, or any such institution of learning and the types of learning that occur there. Architects are very aware of the effect of space on the activities that occur therein. They therefore design accordingly. But not all institutions are designed. Some come into being by happenstance. Portland State University is such a place. Its buildings are of such a wide variety of styles such that nearly the entire history of architecture is represented on its campus. Portland Sate University's campus came to be as the result of convenient purchases and acquisitions. Architectural criticism of the campus is tricky as it is a polyglot of styles lumped together. The interesting task lies in analyzing the effect of these disparate styles on the over all function of the university's pedagogy.

Universities owe their contemporary form largely to enlightenment thinkers. One notable influential architect of the university is Thomas Jefferson whose design continues to influence the design of contemporary schools. Jefferson's University of Virginia is similar to some Oregon schools; there were dormitories, refectories, libraries all on one campus. Indeed the idea of the university as a secular institution on a parcel of land set apart from society, really began here.

Southern Oregon University, Oregon Sate University and the University of Oregon all have many similar qualities to the University of Virginia, including a campus setting, the dormitories and the library all integrated into a singular refuge of learning. Thus Thomas Jefferson said himself, "In fact a university should not be a house but a village."

The functions of a university as a village are numerous. Hypothetically students can become utterly immersed in the culture of learning, and villages largely have a distinct culture for the student to ally or reject. As the pedagogy of education evolves (or dissolves) this mode of spatial design in universities has been experimented with, but seldom profoundly altered. The Pacific Northwest Academy of the arts rehabilitated a warehouse in the Pearl district and squeezed an entire village of learning inside. Ingeniously tearing down the walls such that classes occur without borders between them; set in a warehouse similar to the buildings populating the district it resides in, this building functions as an urban university. This building an almost Byzantine structure; innocuous from the outside, a pure academic setting on the inside (no Subway Sandwich stores or trendy Pizzicattos).

Remnants of the structure's former purpose live on in the still-working

industrial scale that sits in the building's main foyer. The affect of this space on the universities pedagogy is the breaking down of barriers between disciplines. While a student works in one area of the building, they can look across the building at see another student working in another medium. The student constantly is aware of their work's context.

All kinds of educational experiences are effected by their settings. Imagine the entirely on-line university and the types of socially starved uni-bombers such an institution would breed. Universities seldom are housed in the penthouses of sky scrapers, nor in airports. Schools taut their proximity to urban centers, or their pastoral seclusion. PSU's motto reflects this; "Let Knowledge Serve the Community," (but not the students). The value of different settings for education is also expressed in the numerous study abroad programs available to students. There are overt and latent pedagogues and curricula in every university. As one can study architecture in a Russian university, one will learn lessons of Russian culture as well as lessons of architecture.

Portland State University is an urban campus made up of buildings mostly built during different time periods. The campus envelops areas that are entirely private.



There are therefore latent affects on the urban campus such as Portland State University. These latent influences affect culture of down town Portland and affect PSU's pedagogy. It is not hard to imagine how PSU would be different if it was entirely comprised of buildings of one of its represented styles; how each department would operate differently given different spatial concerns. A drama department in Smith without a stage, for example.

In critiquing the campus' buildings it is important to consider how they relate and interact. Although very few of the campus' buildings were built with the rest of the campus in mind, they none the less (dis)function together.

Lincoln Hall is perhaps Portland State's most silly building. Originally built as a high school, it's columns and facade are classically inspired. It's a building with history, famed abstract expressionist painter Mark Rothko attended school here. It oozes culture, expired stuffy dead white male culture, the least trendy of all, but culture none the less. It is the building on campus with the most taste, whether good or bad taste, this is arguable. It stands in direct opposition to a building like Neuberger Hall which was conceived to be as cheap as possible.

Buildings like Neuberger are sterile and economic and therefore lacking

taste. Lincoln hall is a formulaic building, it has the grand entrance, a performance and public area, and has traditional classrooms as you can imagine. It currently houses PSU's theater department and music department among others. How odd it would be if a similar building housed the computer science department, or ironic if such a building housed the Multicultural Center. It was not designed specifically to house a drama department or a music department and I'm sure its acoustics are lousy. But its age made it the natural venue for music and theatrical performance.

Neuberger and Smith halls are peculiar buildings as they are both frozen in an early stage of their construction. Both were designed to be expandable upward. If you ever are in Neuberger's stairwells, you will notice how they continue upward past the last floor, awaiting an expansion. The exteriors of these buildings feign an interest in material, some brick and glass is exposed, but really these buildings are pure economy, or brutal spaces. Architectural critic John Ruskin wrote, "Life without industry is guilt, industry without art is brutality." As these buildings demonstrate economically conceived design, and to be economical is akin to being industrial. Therefore these are brutal buildings. They are the

most floor space possible for the least amount of money.

The space adjoining the two buildings is perhaps the most vulgar architectural passage in all of Portland. Here await dumpsters, trash cans, political canvassers, credit card salesman, debutante PSU politicians, OCD cell phone rambles... and on the cracked concrete ground there lie a million discarded cigarette butts and gum wads. Some of my most vivid PSU memories are of being overwhelmed with the futility of one of my group grope University Studies classes, walking out and finding myself in this wasteland and being overcome with loathing.

Not that Neuberger and Smith are the embodiment of evil in architecture, despite their hideous appearance, they hold infinite opportunity. Indeed, the idea of expanding them upward in a playful way intrigues me. As these buildings sit in the heart of campus, their expansion or demolition is very logical. I would propose an expansion mindful of their awkward past. Adjoining the two above the treetops and adding more outdoor space on top could extend the outdoor programming possibilities of the already overextended park blocks. The Pompedu modern art museum in Paris is also a building of pure economy, but it is devised to serve art. It is in a sense a non-building, more of a



structure. Atop is the best place to sip espresso in Paris, for the views are unmatched. A brutal space has a place in building, only if it serves art, not to amplify the obnoxiousness of a space as does the passage of architecture between Smith and Neuberger.

Even so, a PSU comprised entirely of Neuberger and Smiths is a horrifying thought. I think if this scenario were to come about, PSU would largely be a business and technical school. It's ironic that in these artless waste lands the English and art departments are housed. It's apt as well, because we live in a society that has abandoned its arts in lieu of such utterly indefinable things such as 'Multi-cultural collaborate art,' and ever expanding corporate influence in the educational setting.

The new Urban Studies Building is quite a clever structure. Made of red brick, it references the predominant styles of Portland's old town Richardsonian Romanesque buildings such as the venerable Dekum on Third and Morrison. Its progressive integration of public transportation is both playful and European. The trolley that originates there seamlessly links the university to Portland's real library, Powell's books (as the definition of a library as a building of universal accessibility precludes government monitored internet kiosks and a Starbucks any-

where on the premises).

This building harbors distinct flaws as well. There is no stylistic reference on the building to the rest of the university's campus. Thus it is a complete anomaly and refuses to function within the campus as a whole. Also, its ground floors are dedicated to commercial shop fronts, which is indicative of the current blurring education and business. The building stands alone as a fine one, but does nothing to function within a campus village.

A campus made up of the Urban Studies Center would resemble an upper class outdoor mall. A clean and handsome complex whose ground floors would be devoted to shops. This might be a trend in chronological development of the campus. From the temple-like Lincoln hall, to Smith Center's food court, to the mall like structure of the Urban Studies center, there is an increasing number of shops. Will future campuses resemble big box retail? It is a fine line between the seamless function of the Pacific Northwest College of Art's wall-less campus to the departments of a Wal-mart.

My favorite of PSU's structures are its parking lots. It's these things that will be marveled after by future archeologists. Someday I will write an anthropological study of the rise of the ballet like art of skate boarding as a result of the rise of bad

architecture in the world. From atop these behemoths one has the best views of Portland. It's in these buildings I spent my teen years drunk, terrorizing lot attendants, gliding down the gentle slopes. I include this as a poetic aside, but the next time you see a parking lot in the rain, think of Pablo Neruda's words, "Is there anything in the world sadder than a train standing in the rain?"

In analyzing the aesthetic of the campus, I hope to draw a picture of the culture of the PSU village. PSU is a polyglot of discarded buildings, all disparate in style, each an island in the city block grid, much as each department is isolated and unconcerned with the rest of the building. I am not a proponent of the group grope 'it takes a village' movement in education where all knowledge is arbitrarily rendered subjective for the purposes of endless University Seminars that cost the a school nothing to host, but I do believe it's a university's responsibility to provide a cohesive pedagogy, a campus culture unified with direct statements of intent, no matter how misguided. This allows the student to either accept the predominant culture, or refuse it, not be overwhelmed with institutional apathy or to join a self righteous political mob.

PSU's ala carte approach to educa-

continued on page 22

FRENCH MILITARY HISTORY

Gallic Wars - Lost. In a war whose ending foreshadows the next 2000 years of French history, France is conquered by of all things, an Italian.

Hundred Years War - Mostly lost, saved at last by female schizophrenic who inadvertently creates the First Rule of French Warfare; "France's armies are victorious only when not led by a Frenchman."

Italian Wars - Lost. France becomes the first and only country to ever lose two wars when fighting Italians.

Wars of Religion - France goes 0-5-4 against the Huguenots

Thirty Years War - France is technically not a participant, but manages to get invaded anyway. Claims a tie on the basis that eventually the other participants started ignoring her.

The Dutch War - Tied

War of the Augsburg League/King William's War/French and Indian War - Lost, but claimed as a tie. Three ties in a row induces deluded Frogophiles the world over to label the period as the height of French military power.

War of the Spanish Succession - Lost. The War also gave the French their first taste of a Marlborough, which they have loved every since.

American Revolution - In a move that will become quite familiar to future Americans, France claims a win even though the English colonists saw far more action. This is later known as "de Gaulle Syndrome", and leads to the Second Rule of French Warfare; "France only wins when America does most of the fighting."

French Revolution - Won, primarily due the fact that the opponent was also French.

The Napoleonic Wars - Lost. Temporary victories (remember the First Rule!) due to leadership of a Corsican, who ended up being no match for a British footwear designer.

The Franco-Prussian War - Lost.

World War I - Tied and on the way to losing, France is saved by the United States.

World War II - Lost. Conquered French liberated by the United States and Britain just as they finish learning the Horst Wessel Song.

War in Indochina - Lost.

Algerian Rebellion - Lost. This marks the first defeat of a western army by a Non-Turkic Muslim force since the Crusades, and produces the First Rule of Muslim Warfare; "We can always beat the French." This rule is identical to the First Rules of the Italians, Russians, Germans, English, Dutch, Spanish, Vietnamese and Esquimaux.

War on Terrorism - France, keeping in mind its recent history, surrenders to Germans and Muslims just to be safe.

This is an email circulating in the military community.

Confederacy of Dunces *Continued from page 7*

cites chapter and verse, the students will argue to him from their assumptions, cultivated through years of cultural conditioning. God is a god of love. God forgives everything, no matter what. Jesus wore Birkenstocks. All of that. And so they argue, confusing their assumptions with erudition and their knee jerk opinions with intellectualism.

When Preacher Dan answers back, bringing up those names we are all vaguely familiar with, and know them as Bible characters, and he puts them in context, trying to clarify, and reassert, again citing chapter and verse. This will usually go about three rounds of the student trying to trick Preacher Dan, or confuse him with their 'superior'

intellect, and then winds up with the student saying something like "Well if that's what Heaven's like, then I think we all would rather be in Hell." Upon pronouncing this, the student will invariably turn to his fellow students and laugh, as though he had won, and not made a complete fool out of himself instead.

This is the rub. Preacher Dan's vision of the Bible may be argumentative, and even destructive, but that doesn't make him wrong. He may be that too, but at least he's arguing from the side of knowledge. The students who disagree with him are merely arguing from the standpoint of cultural assumption and emotion. They don't question his basic principles

and assumptions, and they haven't learned enough to challenge him out of the source material. They're simply bullying like any belligerent, arguing out of pure emotion. And when they do that, they're doing themselves a disservice. By demeaning him, by mocking him, by assaulting him both verbally and physically, they're making his position easier. It's much easier to feel right and righteous when you're being made into a martyr for your beliefs than it is to coldly stand before an intellectual crowd and answer for each and every point of faith. By attacking him with arrogant and mean spirited quips, these so called intellectuals are actually strengthening the position, not of learning and ideas,

Something Behind the Chair *Continued from page 8*

fund. (\$170,000 to be exact.) The scheme might have continued unrecognized, if not for several fatal highway accidents caused by under-qualified truckers with fake licenses. Several of Ryan's top officials have been indicted in the case, including Dean Bauer, the inspector general whom Ryan per-

sonally hired to crack down on corruption. Even though Ryan claims to have no idea what was going on in the highest levels of his administration, it is quite likely that he will also be indicted in the near future.

These affairs are just a few of the most obvious examples of corruption in George Ryan's career.

According to Illinois Court-reformer Sherman Skolnick, Ryan has been investigated by the IRS for receiving kickbacks from riverboat gambling casinos, money laundering, and reselling charitable contributions from pharmaceutical companies. Ever since his days as a small-time public offi-

A War for Oil? *Continued from page 9*

Saddam Hussein much more dangerous than your run-of-the-mill dictator, because they give him the ability to build not only palaces

but also top-of-the-line weapons of mass destruction.

Americans recognize this. Europeans don't. Why not? Here's

my theory: Europeans are projecting their own behavior onto us. They know that their own foreign policies have in the past often been

PSU Architecture *Continued from page 20*

tion where students are alienated by the bureaucracy of education and the alienating lay out of PSU's disparate architectural lay-out are not a coincidence. As a whole, PSU is a University by default, born of

the need to educate Vanport area labor in Portland's Post war industrial neighborhoods, stolen away to service the apathetic middle class, it is the least it can possibly be while still being considered a school.

The buildings being annexed as they become available are part of the proof of this. PSU's lack of student government (abysmal election turn outs) and race mongering student politicians (the mob like attack of

HEALTHY BODY SICK MIND

BY SEAN H. BOGGS

Dell Dude Gets Arrested

Dude, you would have been arrested and jail-fucked but since you had a silly little catch phrase in a shitty little commercial, you get to go home.

There are only two kinds of people in the world who smoke pot: people who sell Dell computers and people who...buy...pot. In this case, society happily mixed the two common potheads into one famously annoying pothead – Benjamin Curtis.

Curtis, otherwise known as the “Dell Dude,” was arraigned and set free on bail a few weeks back, after police arrested him for buying a small bag of reefer. At his trial, Curtis cried, “Dude, I don’t want to go to jail” and was sent home. The 22-year-old theater student (an often forgotten third type of people who smoke pot) was told by the judge (fourth type) that if he keeps his nose clean (an obvious cocaine reference to those who enjoy finding ironic misfortunes in others) for an entire year, the charges will be dropped, and with any luck, he can fade into Hell with the other little fuckers who make their living saying one-liners in shitty commercials. Oh, that last part was a quote from the judge himself; sorry I did not quote it with those little “quotation marks.”

To make matters slightly worse for his image, Curtis was arrested in a blue and red kilt, a tuxedo jacket, beige knee socks and white sneakers. His lawyer claims that Curtis had just left a “Scottish-themed” party, but we all know the real truth. This was just a cover for the fact that the computer company, Dell, is in consideration to play the bad guy in *Braveheart Two*. Now, you may be wondering, “how

can computer company play the bad guy in a movie?” Well, that is because you are confused, and now after feeling awfully puzzled, you should stop asking questions.



So, with his career up in smoke, (ha, ha) it looks like Curtis will have to spend the rest of his days going to school, and paying his bills.

Aw, shit, and he thought that he wouldn’t have to finally lead a normal fucking life. Too bad.

Dude, I could fucking care less. I hate fucking computers.

It’s only a few more Hours until the *Gangs of Chicago*.

I got my watch set for March 23, the day of the Academy Awards, and after an entire year of wasting money on shitty movies and really buttery popcorn, I am anxiously awaiting the announcements for which movies were better than all of the others.

As an avid movie freak, (this is not the typical freak who enjoys *Lord of the Rings* movies and jerking off while watching Anime) I saw an awful lot of movies this

year. I had some favorites, (*Gangs of New York*) and then I had some that would have been better if they were named *Gangs of New York*. All in all, a decent year for movies.

So, it’s now time for my predictions.

But first, if you saw any of the following movies: *Daredevil*, *How to Lose a Guy in 10 Days*, *Kangaroo Jack*, any movie with Martin Lawrence and/or *Just Married*, you are no longer allowed to continue reading. Reason being is that because of you, there will be sequels to each one of these absolutely shitty, brainless movies. And if this is you, stop complaining that Americans have become so dumb. It’s because of you that these movies were made.

And now back to my predictions for those who actually watch intelligent movies.

Best Picture: *Gangs of New York* because Daniel Day-Lewis was utterly amazing.

Best Actor: Is there an echo in the building? Day-Lewis, *Gangs of New York*.

Best Actress: Renee Zellweger, *Chicago*. Don’t know why, but she gave me a boner. I guess Nicole Kidman could win, but *The Hours* was boring and her nose looked funny.

Best Director – Martin Scorsese, *Gangs of New York*. He didn’t win for *Raging Bull*, *Taxi Driver*, *Cape Fear*, the *Color of Money* or *Casino*, so it is about Academy Award fucking time he finally does win.

Okay, I think I am done and quite satisfied, now on to the red carpet.

MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2003

IRAQI FORCES CONQUER FRANCE


COLIN POWELL: WE'LL GO THRU THE U.N. EVEN IF IT TAKES YEARS
TURKEY BLOCKS NATO ASSISTANCE

The Reaction of International Markets

PRICE CHANGES



**BERETS
+4%**



A shocked Jacques Chirac

The French were shocked to see their country conquered once again.

Once more the defensive strategy of France seems to be behind the times.

The military plan for the defense of the country called "Maginot II: Notes Toward a Defensive Posture" proved thoroughly inadequate. For the Iraqis it was a rather uneventful morning.

The only resistance reported was that of French farmers who

had blocked a major highway to the south of Paris to demand farm subsidies and protectionism.

When the farmers realized that the army was foreign they immediately dispersed and went on to vandalize a nearby McDonalds.

If, for the Iraqis, this most recent adventure has proven an easy ride, the same thing cannot be said about the French. A nation unable to deconstruct this most recent experience seems to have fallen into a deep bout of collective depression. A French philosopher said, "The Iraqi invasion seems to transcend a certain idea of France."



Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of